DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 964 JC 700 121

AUTHOR Krupka, John G.
TITLE Report on Faculty and Student Evaluation of Instructor Rating Questionnaire.
PUB DATE Mar 70
NOTE 11p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Evaluation Criteria, Faculty Evaluation, *Junior Colleges, *Teacher Evaluation

ABSTRACT

A comparison of faculty and student evaluation of an instructor-rating questionnaire at Northampton County Area Community College, Pennsylvania, is the subject of this report. Students and faculty members were asked to specify the relative importance of 12 given areas considered in instructor evaluation, and then to suggest scores between 10 and zero for both a theoretically excellent and poor teacher in each of the 12 areas. The comparison of responses suggests that: a highly positive correlation exists between each group's rating of the areas: the areas are not considered as having equal importance; and the mean ratings of students indicating scores for the excellent and poor teacher in each area were consistently higher than those given by the faculty. [Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document.] (JO)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED038964

NORTHAMPTON COUNTY AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Report on Faculty and Student Evaluation of Instructor Rating Questionnaire

by John G. Krupka

March 1970

Faculty and students at Northampton County Area Community College participated in the evaluation of an Instructor Rating Questionnaire (IRQ). This report compares the way the faculty and students rated the twelve areas of the IRQ and the scores that they thought represented good and poor rating for each area. A copy of the questionnaire is appended.

One hundred and sixty students, selected systematically from the total list of students by the Office of Instruction, were sent the IRQ. Sixty returned and valid questionnaires represent the students' evaluation.

The first area of concern was whether or not the faculty and students felt that the twelve rating areas were equivalent, i.e., that each one is equal in importance in judging a teacher. Both groups were asked to rank the twelve areas from 1 to 12, from most important to least important. If each area was equivalent one would expect a mean rating of 6.50 for each area.

The following are the twelve rating areas:

I. Instructor's Knowledge of Subject
II. Organization of Course
III. Assignments
IV. Ability to Arouse Interest-Skill in Guiding the Learning Process
V. Classroom Presentation
VI. Mannerisms
VII. Grading
VIII. Willingness to Help
IX. Speech and Enunciation
X. Use of Language
XI. General Estimate of Teacher
XII. General Estimate of the Course

JC 700 121

The mean ratings and their standard deviations were computed for both groups. Standard deviation is a measure of central tendency. The smaller the S.D., the more numbers center around the mean. The following table compares the ratings of the two groups.

Distribution of Mean Ratings of the Twelve Areas of the IRQ by Faculty and Students (*)

AREA	FACULTY		STUDENTS	
	mean	S. D.	mean	S. D.
I	2.93	2.37 (1)	2.27	1.53 (1)
II	4.12	2.44 (4)	3.56	1.41 (3)
III	5.74	2.42 (5)	7.90	2.36 (7)
IV	3.51	2.67 (2)	2.67	1.85 (2)
V	4.00	2.31 (3)	4.25	2.31 (4)
VI	8.11	3.23 (8)	8.97	2.24 (10)
VII	7.35	2.45 (7)	7.57	2.51 (6)
VIII	6.11	2.63 (6)	5.25	2.06 (5)
IX	8.35	1.95 (9)	8.37	2.08 (8)
X	8.46	2.23 (10)	8.50	1.20 (9)
XI	8.86	3.21 (11)	9.30	3.19 (11)
XII	10.40	2.39 (12)	9.57	3.16 (12)

(*) The numbers in parentheses represent the ranking of the area. For example, both the faculty and the students rank areas I and IV as first and second in importance in the judgment of a teacher.

The rank-difference coefficient of correlation was computed between the rankings of the two groups and this is equal to 0.95. The interpretation is that there exists a very strong positive relationship between the way faculty judge these areas and the way students judge these areas.

Using the theoretical mean rating (6.50) as a point of division of those areas that are most important and least important, the areas judged most important by each group are:

Important Areas in the Evaluation of a Teacher

Faculty	Students
(1) Instru. Know. of Subject	(1) Instru. Know. of Subject
(2) Ability to Arouse Interest	(2) Ability to Arouse Interest
(3) Classroom presentation	(3) Organization of Course
(4) Organization of Course	(4) Classroom presentation
(5) Assignments	(5) Willingness to Help
(6) Willingness to Help	

In a comparison of the standard deviation of each group it can be seen that the students are more homogeneous in their thinking.

Conclusions:

(1) that both faculty and students feel that the twelve areas are not equivalent.

(2) that the faculty and the students rate the areas in a highly positive correlated manner.

The second area of concern is what scores reflect excellent and poor ratings of an instructor in each of the twelve areas. The students were asked to give a score, from 10 to 0, for a theoretical excellent teacher and theoretical poor teacher for each of the twelve areas. The following table compares the ratings of the two groups.

Faculty-Student Theoretical Ratings

	Faculty				Student			
	E		P		E		P	
Area	mean	S. D.	mean	S. D.	mean	S. D.	mean	S. D.
I	8.23	0.88	2.58	1.29	9.25	0.77	3.48	2.28
II	8.02	1.12	2.60	1.27	8.45	1.11	3.20	1.96
III	7.47	1.45	2.32	1.18	7.85	1.36	3.03	2.06
IV	7.61	1.53	2.07	1.46	9.27	1.07	2.65	1.88
V	7.53	1.28	2.23	1.13	8.63	1.02	3.28	1.59
VI	6.88	1.64	2.28	1.34	7.77	1.45	3.18	2.20
VII	7.51	1.68	2.44	1.59	8.55	1.24	3.37	1.93
VIII	7.65	1.43	2.18	1.14	9.35	0.86	3.23	2.31
IX	7.11	1.38	2.07	0.95	8.15	1.26	3.52	2.28
X	7.02	1.47	2.04	1.02	8.27	1.18	3.53	2.08
XI	7.33	1.79	2.02	1.09	8.68	1.26	2.97	1.80
XII	6.49	2.48	1.65	1.20	8.57	1.21	3.27	2.08

The first thing that should be noted in the table is the consistant manner in which the faculty's rating of an excellent teacher is less than that of the students rating. This difference in mean ratings for the theoretical excellent teacher is significant at the .001 level. This difference could be caused by the "self-protection" effect. The faculty also feel that a poor teacher would be indicated by a lower score than that indicated by the students.

If all areas are rated equally, as they are now, the grand mean ratings for each category for each group is:

Grand Mean Ratings

	Faculty		Student	
	Excellent	Poor	Excellent	Poor
Mean	7.40	2.21	8.57	3.23
S.D.	1.51	1.22	1.15	2.04

Using the students ratings for each area, and assuming these ratings of a theoretical teacher reflect the ratings these students would in fact make for a real live excellent instructor, then area norms can be established. These norm ranges will be established using the following method: for Area I the mean and standard deviation of the students rating for an excellent teacher are 9.25 and 0.77 respectively. A range of 9.25 ± 0.77 would represent the range in which most excellent teacher ratings would fall. A teacher receiving a rating below 9.25 - 0.77 = 8.48 would be judged not an excellent teacher. A teacher receiving a rating above mean + S. D. would really be an exceptionally excellent teacher. This same procedure will be used to determine area normative ranges for a poor teacher.

Normative Student Ratings of An Excellent Teacher

Area	Normative Range
I	8.48 - 10.00
II	7.34 - 9.56
III	6.49 - 9.21
IV	8.20 - 10.00
V	7.61 - 9.65
VI	6.32 - 9.22
VII	7.31 - 9.79
VIII	8.49 - 10.00
IX	6.89 - 9.41
X	7.09 - 9.45
XI	7.42 - 9.94
XII	7.36 - 9.78
Grand Mean	7.42 - 9.67

Normative Student Ratings of a Poor Teacher

Area	Normative Range
I	5.76 - 1.20
II	5.16 - 1.24
III	5.09 - 0.97
IV	4.53 - 0.77
V	4.87 - 1.69
VI	5.38 - 0.98
VII	5.30 - 1.44
VIII	5.54 - 0.92
IX	5.80 - 1.24
X	5.61 - 1.45
XI	4.77 - 1.17
XII	5.35 - 1.19
Grand Mean	5.26 - 1.19

The third area of concern of this study was student opinion of the IRQ. When the students were surveyed they were asked to comment on the rating questionnaire, was it good, bad, were there areas to delete or add. It seemed, to this researcher, that most of the students took advantage of this opportunity. The Instruction Office has recorded these comments.

Final Conclusions and Implications:

1. The scoring and evaluation of the ratings of the IRQ should be changed.

2. The actual ratings should be compared with these theoretical ratings.

103205

Questionnaire Code Number

NORTHAMPTON COUNTY AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

INSTRUCTOR RATING QUESTIONNAIRE

PURPOSE

The main task of the college is teaching. It is of first importance that the college be continuously informed of the quality of its teaching and the respects in which that teaching can be improved. Students are in a position to judge the quality of teaching from direct experience, and in order to secure this information, you are asked to rate your instructor on the questionnaire which is attached.

TO THE STUDENT

Space is provided on the questionnaire for you to include comments after each question. Please make comments that will clarify your rating and/or that will help the instructor in improving his teaching. You are asked to sign your evaluation (on this cover sheet which will be detached and turned in separately), but the cover sheet with your signature will never be identified with the questionnaire by the instructor unless your permission has first been obtained by the Dean of Instruction. However, the instructor, his Division Chairman and/or the Dean of Instruction may review the completed questionnaires (without the cover sheets) and the comments you made on them.

_____

Date

_____

Course title and section

_____

Instructor

_____

Your signature

DIRECTIONS

For each item on the questionnaire that you feel you can answer, circle the place on the rating scale which seems to you most appropriate for the instructor you are rating. The highest possible rating for an item is 10; the lowest is 0, with nine gradations between. To aid you in making your marking, note the three descriptions for each item -- the one at the left for the best rating, the one at the right for the poorest rating.

PLEASE MAKE COMMENTS THAT WILL CLARIFY YOUR RATING IN THE SPACE PROVIDED AFTER EACH QUESTION.

103205

Questionnaire Code Number

NORTHAMPTON COUNTY AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

INSTRUCTOR RATING QUESTIONNAIRE

Date

Course title and section

Instructor

1. INSTRUCTOR'S KNOWLEDGE OF SUBJECT

10 9 8 7 Knowledge of subject broad and accurate

6 5 4 3 Knowledge of subject somewhat limited occasionally

2 1 0 Knowledge of subject occasionally deficient or inaccurate

Comment on whether his knowledge of the subject is up-to-date...AND/OR...Pinpoint areas of excellence or weakness...AND/OR...Comment on the reason for your rating: _____

2. ORGANIZATION OF COURSE

10 9 8 7 Course exceptionally well organized.

6 5 4 3 Course satisfactorily organized

2 1 0 Organization very poor

Comment on whether the textbooks are particularly appropriate...AND/OR...
Comment on whether the course organization aided your note-taking...AND/OR...
Comment on the reason for your rating: _____

3. ASSIGNMENTS

10 9 8 7 Exceptionally clear and reasonable; coordinated with class work; imaginative & well-constructed

6 5 4 3 Clear, reasonable, coordinated with class work

2 1 0 Confused or indefinite or unrelated to class work

Comment on whether time allowed for assignments was sufficient...AND/OR... Pin-point areas of excellence or weakness...AND/OR...Comment on the reason for your rating: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. ABILITY TO AROUSE INTEREST - SKILL IN GUIDING THE LEARNING PROCESS

10 9 8 7 Interest among students usually runs high

6 5 4 3 Students seem interested

2 1 0 Majority of students inattentive most of time.

Comment on the ways he stimulated your thinking or encouraged your participation...AND/OR...Comment on the reason for your rating: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. CLASSROOM PRESENTATION

10 9 8 7 Classroom techniques always skillful and well-chosen

6 5 4 3 Classroom techniques generally effective

2 1 0 Classroom techniques often inappropriate or unskillful

Comment on whether he employs a variety of techniques (lecture, discussion, demonstration, visual aids)...AND/OR...Pin-point areas of excellence or weakness AND/OR...Comment on the reason for your rating: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. MANNERISMS

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
Mannerisms pleasing — Mannerisms not objectionable — Constantly exhibits annoying mannerisms

Pin-point examples (speech, gestures) worthy of mention...AND/OR...Comment on the reason for your rating: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. GRADING

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
Always fair and impartial; makes comments that are helpful to student — Usually fair and impartial — Unfair; shows partiality

Comment on whether the system of grading was made clear to the class or yourself...AND/OR...Comment on whether the tests adequately covered the content of the course...AND/OR...Explain your rating: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. WILLINGNESS TO HELP

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0
Always willing to help students — Willing to help students — Unwilling to help students

Comment on whether the instructor was available to you...AND/OR...Comment on the reason for your rating: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. SPEECH AND ENUNCIATION

10 9 8 7 — Speaks clearly and distinctly; has varied or vivid style

6 5 4 3 — Speaks clearly and distinctly

2 1 0 — Words sometimes indistinct and hard to hear

Pin-point areas of excellence or weakness...AND/OR...Comment on the reason for your rating: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. USE OF LANGUAGE

10 9 8 7 — Uses language carefully; improves vocabulary of the class.

6 5 4 3 — Uses language appropriate to the level of the class

2 1 0 — Uses language too difficult for the class

Make suggestions...AND/OR...Comment on the reason for your rating: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

11. GENERAL ESTIMATE OF TEACHER

10 9 8 7 — Very superior teacher

6 5 4 3 — Average teacher

2 1 0 — Very poor teacher

Comment on what advice you would give to a friend who was considering taking a course from this instructor...AND/OR...Comment on the reason for your rating:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. GENERAL ESTIMATE OF THE COURSE

10 9 8 7	6 5 4 3	2 1 0
One of the most interesting, informative, useful, personally helpful courses	About average in interest, usefulness, etc.	One of the least interesting, informative, useful, personally helpful courses

Comment on whether you think the course is too difficult for the level intended...AND/OR...Make suggestions...AND/OR...Comment on the reason for your rating: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAY 14 1970

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION